ORIGINAL



1

2

3

4

5

COMMISSIONERS

KRISTIN K. MAYES, Chairman GARY PIERCE

PAUL NEWMAN SANDRA D. KENNEDY

BOB STUMP

2010 DEC -7 A 11: 25

DOCKET CONTROL

BEFORE THE ARIZONA CORPORATION Arizona Corporation Commission

DOCKETED

DEC 7 2010

DOCKETED BY



6

7

8

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

IN THE MATTER OF:

JERE PARKHURST and MICHELLE PARKHURST, husband and wife, doing business as C-Street Financial Group and C-Street Development, L.L.C.;

10 C-STREET HOLDINGS, L.L.C., a dissolved Arizona liability company,

PHOENIX FINANCIAL HOLDINGS, L.L.C., a terminated Arizona limited liability company

Respondents.

DOCKET NO. S-20761A-10-0409

PROCEDURAL ORDER (Schedules a Pre-Hearing Conference And a Hearing)

BY THE COMMISSION:

On October 1, 2010, the Securities Division ("Division") of the Arizona Corporation ("Commission") filed a Notice of Opportunity for Hearing ("Notice") against Jere Parkhurst and Michelle Parkhurst, husband and wife, Jere Parkhurst dba C-Street Financial Group ("CFG") and C-Street Development, L.L.C. ("CSD"), C-Street Holdings, L.L.C. ("CSH") and Phoenix Financial Holdings, L.L.C. ("PFH") (collectively "Respondents"), in which the Division alleged multiple violations of the Arizona Securities Act ("Act") in connection with the offer and sale of securities in the form of notes.

The Respondents were duly served with a copy of the Notice.

On October 15, 2010, a letter was filed by Respondent Jere Parkhurst requesting a hearing for himself, CFG, CSD, CSH, and PFH, and indicating that he was attempting to obtain counsel. Michelle Parkhurst was not mentioned and had not signed the letter.

On October 20, 2010, by Procedural Order, a pre-hearing conference was scheduled to review the status of the proceeding on December 2, 2010. Respondents were advised they could retain

26

27

28

counsel or they could represent themselves pursuant to the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure A.A.C. R14-3-101 *et seq.* and the Rules of the Arizona Supreme Court.

On November 29, 2010, Mr. Parkhurst filed a motion to continue the pre-hearing conference until a later date in January, 2011. Mr. Parkhurst indicated he was still in the process of retaining counsel.

On November 30, 2010, the Division filed a response to Mr. Parkhurst's motion and stated that almost seven weeks had passed and a further delay of the proceeding was unreasonable and should not be granted.

On November 30, 2010, by Procedural Order, Mr. Parkhurst's motion to continue the proceeding was denied.

On December 2, 2010, the pre-hearing conference was held as previously ordered. The Division appeared with counsel. There were no appearances by the Respondents or anyone on their behalf. Counsel for the Division requested that a hearing be scheduled with enough time allowed to ensure Respondent, Michelle Parkhurst, could be properly served since the Division had been unable to serve her.

On December 3, 2010, Respondent, Michelle Parkhurst, filed a letter requesting a hearing apparently after she was apprised of the proceeding.

Under the circumstances, another pre-hearing conference should be scheduled to allow Mrs. Parkhurst to enter an appearance in the proceeding and a hearing scheduled as requested by the Division.

IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED that A pre-hearing conference shall be held on January 6, 2011, at 10:30 a.m., or as soon thereafter as is practicable at the Commission's offices, 1200 West Washington Street, Room 100, Phoenix, Arizona, as previously ordered.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED a hearing shall be held on April 13, 2011, at 10:00 a.m., at the Commission's offices, 1200 West Washington Street, Hearing Room 1, Phoenix, Arizona.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that the parties shall set aside April 14, 2011, for an additional day of hearing, if necessary.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that that the Division and Respondents shall exchange copies

of their Witness Lists and copies of the Exhibits by March 1, 2011, with courtesy copies provided to the presiding Administrative Law Judge.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that if the case is resolved by proposed Consent Order prior to the hearing, the Division shall file a Motion to Vacate the Proceeding.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that the Ex Parte Rule (A.A.C. R14-3-113-Unauthorized Communications) is in effect and shall remain in effect until the Commission's Decision in this matter is final and non-appealable.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that all parties must comply with Rules 31 and 38 of the Rules of the Arizona Supreme Court and A.R.S. § 40-243 with respect to the practice of law and admission pro hac vice.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that withdrawal or representation must be made in compliance with A.A.C. R14-3-104(E) and Rule 1.16 of the Rules of Professional Conduct (under Rule 42 of the Rules of the Arizona Supreme Court). Representation before the Commission includes appearances at all hearings and procedural conferences, as well as all Open Meetings for which the matter is scheduled for discussion, unless counsel has previously been granted permission to withdraw by the Administrative Law Judge or the Commission.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that the Presiding Administrative Law Judge may rescind, alter, amend, or waive any portion of this Procedural Order either by subsequent Procedural Order or by ruling at hearing.

DATED this ______ day of December, 2010.

27

28

ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE

1	Copies of the foregoing mailed/delivered this day of December, 2010 to:
2	
3	Jere Parkhurst Michelle Parkhurst
4	C-STREET FINANCIAL GROUP, et al.
5	P.O. Box 45509 Phoenix, AZ 85064-5509
6	Matt Neubert, Director
7	Securities Division ARIZONA CORPORATION COMMISSION
8	1300 West Washington Street
9	Phoenix, AZ 85007
10	ARIZONA REPORTING SERVICE, INC. 2200 North Central Avenue, Suite 502
11	Phoenix, AZ 85004-1481
12	By: Werson for
13	Debra Broyles Secretary to Marc E. Stern
14	becreatly to Wate D. Stern
15	
16	
ا 17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	